CIDAC
Centro de Documentação
TL 4496

coupled with a sound monetary policy—I am confident that we can turn this Nation around and regain our competitive position in the world economy.

DRINKING AND DRIVING

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, I should like to share with my colleagues an excellent editorial which appeared in the Boston Sunday Globe on April 26. This editorial, entitled "Drinking and Driving," is as fine a statement as I have seen on the need for strong deterrent legislation to combat drunken drivers. It drives home the point that the certainty of facing an embarrassing penalty—such as five weekends in jail, or an equivalent period of community service—is what is needed to reverse the total acceptance of drinking and driving which pervades our society today.

Last month, along with Senators GLENN, GOLDWATER, and HUDDLESTON, I introduced S. 671, a bill which would provide mandatory penalties for convicted drunken drivers. Persons convicted of this offense for the first time would face a minimum penalty of 10 days of community service, in addition to a restricted driving privilege and other sanctions which may be imposed under State law. I am pleased that the Globe has endorsed the concepts underlying my legislation, and I would like to commend this discussion of the problem to my colleagues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Globe editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DRINKING AND DRIVING

Some announce themselves by the way they go for speed, rumbling and jockeying through a pack. Others have a telltale, lazy drift . . . now in this lane . . . now in the other. Sometimes one will take the wrong ramp onto an expressway, and that's when the killing's nearly certain: screaming head-on pileups, north in the southbound lane. Other times, though, they do it solo—just to themselves—around a tree or a phone pole deep in the country. Drivers under-the-influence.

For random death and destruction nothing beats drunken driving, nothing even comes close. There were 208 murders in Massachusetts in 1979. In that same year there were 920 deaths on the highway, of which about three quarters—say 700—were the work of drunks. These are stupid deaths, cause for anger as much as grief among the survivors.

Drunken driving flourishes here because we tolerate it. In Norway and Sweden if a blood test indicates more than a trace of alcohol in the blood stream, the driver knows he's going to jail. The jail term for a first offender is not long, but it's as certain as the cold north wind. Fancy lawyers and fashionable addresses don't help, and as a result people pay attention to the law. Scandinavians drive and many drink, plenty, but they very rarely do both at the same time, instead, by habit and without apparent difficulty, most simply make other arrangements—car-pooling, a taxi or whatever—so that after serious drinking, there's no need to get behind the wheel.

In Massachusetts and most of the rest of the United States it's a different story. There are over 25,000 "driving under" arrests in the commonwealth each year. In theory, conviction under current Massachusetts law brings automatic revocation of a driver's license for at least a year, but since 1975 for virtually all first offenses—and frequently for subsequent offenses—most District Court judges have "continued without a finding," assigning (or reassigning) defendants to 10-week, one-evening-a-week "re-education" programs. The Registrar of Motor Vehicles, Richard E. McLaughlin dismisses these programs as a "standing joke." Even Dr. Edward Blacker, who heads the state division of alcohol and is a main defender of the programs, acknowledges that nearly half of those arrested are too deeply involved with alcohol to be reached with the resources at hand.

Fuzzy thinking abounds on drunken driving, among the public, among lawmakers and on the bench. One common line begins, "Let's face it, we all take a drink now and then." Yet, properly administered tests give an objective measurement of alcohol content in the bloodstream, and 0.1 percent, the widely accepted threshold for flunking such a test, is sufficiently high so that a 160-pound person has to put away five drinks in an hour to become legally under the influence. Moderate drinkers simply don't exceed the 0.1 percent threshold, nor is anything short of ostentatious drunkenness or involvement in a wreck likely to prompt a policeman to order an alcohol test. It takes certain effort to be charged with "driving under."

It's clear that many judges and lawmakers believe that because a drunken driver doesn't fit the stereotyped image of a "criminal," it's not appropriate to invoke serious penalties. Hence even drunks who have killed frequently get nominal, suspended sentences. The issue, though, should not be the suitability of the arbitrary label "criminal," but rather the capacity of the law to deter a specific life-threatening behavior that is common among otherwise solid citizens. As the Scandinavian experience shows, the certainty of facing an embarrassing penalty gives special pause to people who are not accustomed to severe treatment by the law.

Other than the isolated case of the East Norfolk District Court in Quincy, where judges, prosecutors and probation officers instituted a tough three-weekends-in-jail sentencing program a year ago (and have since seen it bog down because other officials and other courts have not cooperated), most public officials in Massachusetts have not shown that they're serious about drunken driving. If they ever do, a first step should be to study both the Quincy experience and the Pell-Barnes bill recently introduced in the U.S. Senate by Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.). Both approaches stress the use of the law as a deterrent, and both illustrate common-sense measures that are feasible and effective.

The key to rebuilding the deterrent potential of the law is to create certainty that even a first offense will bring down real and unpleasant sanctions. The punishment prescribed by law does not have to be severe for a first offender—indeed if it's too severe judges and prosecutors won't invoke it—but the sanction must sting and embarrass.

Strange as it may seem, yanking the driver's license as a first step is not necessarily the answer. This is a car-bound society in which many people are genuinely dependent on the automobile for their livelihood, or at least for the essentials of everyday life. If a guilty finding automatically triggers a lengthy loss of license which could cost a defendant his job, judges and juries will balk. This reality helps explain the current Massachusetts practice of "continuing without a finding" and prescribing slap-on-the-wrist "re-education."

But there are alternatives, and the Pell-Barnes bill suggests a good one. Pell proposes that in lieu of outright revocation, first offenders have licenses "restricted" to essential travel. Such restrictions could be made enforceable by the issuance of readily identifiable special marker plates. The public embarrassment of having to drive with such plates would be a powerful incentive not to run the risk of being caught.

Some argue that the whole question of license suspensions or restrictions should be left to separate administrative hearings at the Registry. If that were the case, sanctions freely invoked by judges should include (1) stiff fines—up to, say, the equivalent of a month's wages—and (2) brief jail terms—perhaps served on weekends between Friday nights and Monday mornings so as not to disrupt livelihoods. Causing a defendant to miss his standing golf or poker game because he's weekending in the house of correction is just the kind of sanction judges need: light enough to be readily invoked, real enough to make an impression. And appropriate, because nice guy though he may otherwise be, a drunken driver is as much a public menace as a hophead with a sawed-off shotgun.

Whether or not Gov. King and the Legislature accept their responsibilities to deal more seriously with drunken driving, the 150 District Court judges, who heard 25,875 "driving under" complaints last year, have work of their own to do to catch up with their colleagues in Quincy. The courts need a record-keeping system that keeps track of defendants' prior offenses state-wide, so that revolving door "re-education" rulings are plainly visible. Moreover, in dialogue among themselves, judges must face up to the inevitable trade-off between leniency and inconsistency in sentencing, and the law's capacity to deter.

If bench, bar and State House did what should be done on this issue, it's likely that hundreds of Massachusetts lives could be saved each year, and without any important loss of personal freedom. True, there would be an added reason for those of us who both drink and drive to arrange our lives—like the Scandinavians—so we didn't do both at the same time.

But, surely that would be a modest price to pay, considering the alternative.

SITUATION IN EAST TIMOR

Mr. TSONGAS. Mr. President, last October, nine of my colleagues joined me in expressing concern over the tragic situation in the former Portuguese colony of East Timor. In a letter to then Secretary of State Muskie, we spoke of the need to maintain and expand an independent international presence in that territory, in light of continuing reports of armed conflict and the jailing of large numbers of political prisoners.

Our letter also emphasized the plight of families that have been separated by the conflict as well as those who wish to leave East Timor but have not been allowed to do so. Our concern over human rights conditions in East Timor was heightened by Amnesty International's 1980 testimony before Congress and the United Nations of this situation.

A December 9, 1981, article in the New York Times by Henry Kamm provided graphic confirmation of the need to maintain an independent presence on the island. I have continued to follow the situation closely, and read with great interest a February 15, 1981, article on this subject in the New York Times Magazine, also by Henry Kamm. In a letter to the editor in response to the article, I called for American diplomatic efforts to achieve a solution to the conflict.

Recently, I have received a copy of a letter sent by a Roman Catholic priest living in East Timor, detailing conditions on the island as of late last year. If anything, the letter underscores the need to maintain and expand an independent international presence in East Timor, to open the island to additional nongovernmental organizations and the news media, and to find diplomatic means to bring this tragedy to an end.

Mr. President, for the benefit of my colleagues I ask unanimous consent that the following excerpts from the priest's letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SITUATION IN EAST TIMOR

(From a letter by a Roman Catholic priest)

The military struggle between the FRETILIN guerrillas and the Indonesia Army still continues in East Timor, but the presence of the International Committee of the Red Cross has apparently had a moderating influence on the level of violence: the Indonesian Air Force has stopped its policy of heavy bombardments of areas where FRETILIN is active.

From June 10, 1980 to the present, the prisons have been overflowing. The island of Atauro, in particular, has been turned into a penal colony for political prisoners. Almost all the teachers from Baucau-Fatumaca have been imprisoned. Dozens of prisoners are reported to have disappeared.

Despite five years of Indonesian occupation, the Timorese people have not lost their determination to be a free people. Nevertheless, their material situation is little short of desperate. Hunger and disease continue to decimate the population. Several villages have been burned to the ground and their inhabitants sent to concentration camps.

In the resettlement camps people do not have the freedom to cultivate their crops or take care of their livestock. In these camps, the Indonesian military authorities sell food, clothing and medicines at high prices instead of freely distributing these supplies which had been donated to Indonesia for use in East Timor by the ICRC and Catholic Relief Service, CRS.

All public employees in East Timor have been forced to accept naturalization as Indonesian citizens. Those unwilling to do so have lost their jobs and cannot find new ones because the government has forbidden any employer to hire them. Since emigation from East Timor is forbidden by the Indonesian authorities, these people will pay dearly for their acts of defiance. The vast majority have accepted naturalization as Indonesian citizens, but only because they were forced to accept it.

Traveling in the interior of East Timor is strictly controlled by the Indonesian military. Prohibitive tolls are levied on all travelers—rich and poor alike. Because of corruption and exploitation, life in Timor is very expensive. Only the rich can emigrate, due to the large bribes that are demanded by the Indonesian authorities.

Freedom of speech and association do not exist in East Timor. All mail is censored. The torture in the prisons is indescribable, especially for women and children. The confiscation of property belonging to prisoners is commonplace.

The Indonesians appear determined to destroy the educated class in East Timor. Almost all the educated Timorese have been killed or are in constant danger. All high schools are closed. Afetr five years of Indonesian occupation, the highest level of education does not surpass the primary school level. Students are allowed to study abroad, but their are no scholarships available to them.

NATIONAL DRAFTING WEEK

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, the week of April 27 through May 1 has been designated as National Drafting Week by the American Institute for Design and Drafting. This is the ninth year that a week has been set aside so that we may honor the over 360,000 designers and draftsmen in America.

Within 40 years, the equivalent of another America will be built in this country, but before a single building can be built, there must be precise, accurate plans and drawings. Builders need highly skilled drafters before they can turn dreams into solid reality.

This week, we honor the men and women who enable the lines, arrows, and circles on paper to be transformed into new homes for our citizens, new schools for our children, and new commercial structures to help us sustain economic growth. The foundation for the highly skilled and important field of drafting is the quality of education provided by the various professional institutes in this area. In Rhode Island, we are fortunate to have one of the Nation's foremost drafting schools, the Hall Institute of Pawtucket, R.I. The Hall Institute has given hundreds of New Englanders the opportunity to discover their capabilities in drafting, and assume positions in a challenging and important field.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to commend the dedicated professionals in the drafting field, as well as their mentors at places like the Hall Institute.

COASTAL BARRIERS RESOURCES ACT

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, yesterday I introduced S. 1018, the Coastal Barriers Resources Act, which serves to protect and conserve fish and wildlife resources.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1018

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Coastal Barrier Resources Act."

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) habitats which are essential spawning, nursery, nesting, and feeding areas for migratory birds, aquatic organisms, and other wildlife are provided within the coastal barriers along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of the United States and the adjacent wetlands, marshes, estuaries, inlets and nearshore waters;

(2) these fish and wildlife resources and their habitats are being irretrievably damaged and lost due to development on, among, and adjacent to, such coastal barriers;

(3) certain actions and programs of the Federal Government have subsidized and encouraged such development; and

(4) a program of coordinated action by Federal, State, and local governments is critical to the more appropriate use and conservation of fish and wildlife resources and habitats within the coastal barriers.

(b) PURPOSE.—The Congress declares that it is the purpose of this Act to minimize the damage to fish, wildlife and other natural resources associated with the coastal barriers along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts by restricting future Federal expenditures and financial assistance which have the effect of encouraging development of coastal barriers, by establishing a Coastal Barrier Resources System, and by considering the means and measures by which the long-term conservation of these fish, wildlife and other natural resources may be achieved.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "coastal barrier" means—

(A) a depositional geologic feature (such as a bay barrier, tombolo, barrier spit, or barrier island) that—

(i) consists of unconsolidated sedimentary materials,

(ii) is subject to wave, tidal, and wind energies, and

(iii) protects landward aquatic habitats from direct wave attack; and

(B) all associated aquatic habitats, including the adjacent wetlands, marshes, estuaries, inlets, and nearshore waters.

(2) The term "Committees" refers to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Environment and Public Works of the Senate.

(3) The term "financial assistance" means any form of loan, grant, guaranty, insurance, payment, rebate, subsidy, or any other form of direct or indirect Federal assistance other than deposit or account insurance for customers of banks savings and loan associations, credit unions, or similar institutions.

(4) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) The term "System unit" means any coastal barrier, or combination of closely-related coastal barriers, included within the Coastal Barrier Resources System established by section 4 of this Act.

SEC. 4. THE COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES SYSTEM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—(1) There is established the Coastal Barrier Resources System which shall consist of those undeveloped coastal barrier located on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of the United States that are identified and generally depicted on the maps that are entitled "Coastal Barrier Resources System", consecutively numbered 001 and through 125, and dated ————.

(2) A coastal barrier was treated as an undeveloped coastal barrier for purposes of paragraph (1) only if there were few manmade structures on the barrier and these structures, and man's activities on the barrier, did not significantly impede geomorphic and ecological processes.

(3) A coastal barrier which was included within the boundaries of an area established under Federal, State, or local law or held by a qualified organization (as defined in paragraph (3) of section 170(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954), primarily for wildlife refuge, sanctuary, or natural resource conservation purposes was not included within the Coastal Barrier Resources System.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF MAPS.—(1) The maps referred to in paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be available for public inspection at the offices of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service in the District of Columbia and in other appropriate offices of the Service.